

Customer No. 24498  
Attorney Docket No. PF980020  
Office Action Date: January 10, 2008

**REMARKS**

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action of January 10, 2008. Claims 1-10 are pending in the application. By the present amendment, claims 1-10 have been amended to correct typographical errors, informalities and antecedent basis. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection in view of the amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

**CLAIM OBJECTIONS:**

By the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 1-9 due to minor informalities. Claims 1-10 have accordingly been amended to address the informalities listed by the Examiner. Withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

**112 REJECTIONS:**

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite, namely, for lack of clarity or antecedent basis. Claims 1-10 have been amended accordingly to correct the clarity/antecedent basis issues. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**102 REJECTIONS:**

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,523,696 to Saito et al. (hereinafter Saito). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Customer No. 24498  
Attorney Docket No. PF980020  
Office Action Date: January 10, 2008

Saito involves a system and method for conveying operation commands over *different* protocols so that a user may control a target device or receive services over different protocols. In particular, Saito discloses a communication control device which can achieve a uniform service-providing environment without relying on a particular network. As such, a communication control device is provided connected with first and second networks comprising a collecting unit for collecting service information of service providing devices connected with the first network (according to a first protocol depending on the first network), and a notifying unit for notifying the service information to a device connected with the second network (according to a second protocol not depending on the first network). *See* Col. 2, line 49 to Col. 3, line 11.

Accordingly, in Saito it becomes possible to notify service information of service-providing devices connected to a first network, independently from a protocol of a datalink of the first network, to a device on the second network, **regardless of a datalink type of the second network.** *See* Col. 3, lines 12-16. In this regard, Saito involves a ‘translation’ of service information from one network to another which might have different, incompatible protocols. That is, the communication control unit in Saito enables control of a device on a first network from a device on a second network by means of a protocol conversion by the communication control unit.

However, Saito makes no mention of registries, much less local or distant registries as in the present invention, or their equivalent. Saito’s communication control unit fails to disclose or suggest a registry, and even if assuming *arguendo*, that it did, Saito’s communication control unit constitutes a separate element from any of the AV devices it

Customer No. 24498  
Attorney Docket No. PF980020  
Office Action Date: January 10, 2008

controls, and there is no disclosure or suggestion of any device having a local registry **managed at the level of the device**, as presently claimed. As such, Saito does not disclose or suggest any of the presently claimed steps and elements, which mainly involves and relies on the existence and use of registries. Indeed, Saito fails to disclose or suggest, at least, the steps of registering local objects present in a device in a local registry managed at the level of the device, formulating, by a local object, a request for a list of objects, the request being transmitted to a single local registry of the device hosting the local object, propagating the request through the local registry to distant registries, collecting responses to the request by the distant registries and a response of the local registry, and transmitting the responses collected to the local object having formulated the request, as recited in claims 1 and 9.

The Examiner cited Col. 12, line 5 onwards to support the allegation that Saito discloses the claimed elements. Applicant refers to the MPEP Chapter 706 and 37 C.F.R. 1.104(c)(2) which recites:

“(2) In rejecting claims for want of novelty or for obviousness, the examiner must cite the best references at his or her command. When a reference is complex or shows or describes inventions other than that claimed by the applicant, the particular part relied on must be designated as nearly as practicable. The pertinence of each reference, if not apparent, must be clearly explained and each rejected claim specified.”

It is respectfully asserted that the Office Action has failed to point out with any specificity the particular parts relied on in the Saito reference which allegedly teach or suggest the claimed elements. The Office Action has merely referred to ‘the discussion beginning at Col.

Customer No. 24498  
Attorney Docker No. PF980020  
Office Action Date: January 10, 2008

12, line 5' to support the bulk of its 102 rejections. This is believed to be deficient, especially in view of the complexity and length of Saito, as well as its disclosure of inventions which are not relevant to those claimed by the Applicant.

Nevertheless, Applicant has exhaustively reviewed Saito, yet has found no teaching or suggestion of at least any local or distant registry, as presently claimed, or any working equivalent. In particular, the Applicant offers the following summary of Saito, starting at Col. 12, line 5, which describes the four embodiments of Saito:

1) The first embodiment refers to a configuration to realize communication between different devices on different 1394 buses which are not directly bridge connected (e.g., between non-IP terminals and IP terminals). The configuration involves a home network having a transmitting terminal 1, a first AV control terminal 2, a first half gateway 3, a second half gateway 4, a second AV control terminal 5, a receiving terminal 6, a first 1394 bus 11 and a second 1394 bus 12. The half gateways may include various processing units to carry out the physical layer processing, link layer processing, bus management and transaction layer processing for a connected 1394 bus, as well as exchanges of data using the 1394 frames to be transmitted or received that are passing through the first and second multiplexors/demultiplexors.

The first and second AV control terminals each collect various information regarding AV devices on the 1394 bus to which it belongs, and exchange the collected information with each other. However, this is NOT to be confused with registering local objects present in a device in a local registry managed at the level of the device, essentially as claimed in claims 1 and 9.

Namely, the AV control terminals of Saito constitute separate elements from any AV device on the bus. Collecting information regarding devices connected on the *same bus*

Customer No. 24498  
Attorney Docket No. PF980020  
Office Action Date: January 10, 2008

bears no relation to and is NOT to be confused with registering local objects *in a device in a local registry in the device*, as in the present invention.

2) The second embodiment refers to a system configuration in which two home networks are interconnected through a public network. In this embodiment, a first and second AV connection device 204, 205 is provided, each including a datalink switch 222 and public network interface 223. The first AV connection device is notified regarding services provided by service providing devices contained within the second home network.

3) The third embodiment is directed to the second embodiment, wherein such notification is performed using the World Wide Web server and the home page.

4) The fourth embodiment involves wherein a first network and a second network are inter-connected through an AV connection device. The AV connection device serves as a gateway for connecting the home network and Internet.

None of the embodiments described in Saito disclose or suggest at least registering local objects present in a device in a local registry managed at the level of the device, formulating, by a local object, a request for a list of objects, the request being transmitted to a single local registry of the device hosting the local object, propagating the request through the local registry to distant registries, collecting responses to the request by the distant registries and a response of the local registry, and transmitting the responses collected to the local object having formulated the request, essentially as claimed in claims 1 and 9.

In particular, note that Saito does not disclose or suggest the formulation of a request for a list of objects or collecting responses to a request by distant registries. In Saito, communication simply involves transmitting and receiving data between a transmitting and

Customer No. 24498  
Attorney Docket No. PF980020  
Office Action Date: January 10, 2008

receiving terminal. One skilled in the art reading Saito would never arrive at the solution recited in claims 1 and 9.

Advantageously, the present invention boasts at least the following distinctions and advantages lacking in Saito:

- In the present invention, each object (e.g., software module) registers itself on a local registry only
- each device stores information local to the device; thus if the device disappears, only its information is lost
- requests are propagated to only a specified group of other registries, not to all the elements in the network
- each object is a resource available to other objects

For at least these reasons, claims 1 and 9 and dependent claims 2-8 and 10, respectively, are believed to be in condition for allowance for at least the above stated reasons. Reconsideration of the rejection is earnestly solicited.

Customer No. 24498  
Attorney Docket No. PF980020  
Office Action Date: January 10, 2008

**RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

**CONCLUSION**

**SEP 08 2008**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims now pending in the application are in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of the case is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 1/8/08

By: 

Paul Kiel  
(Registration No. 40,677)

**Mailing Address:**

**Thomson Licensing LLC  
PO Box 5312  
Princeton, NJ 08540**